

MAR 25 2008

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MOLLY DWYER, ACTING CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

BALLTAZAR PINTOR-PINTOR;
LETICIA ESQUIVEL-GARCIA,

Petitioners,

v.

MICHAEL B. MUKASEY, Attorney
General,

Respondent.

No. 05-72707

Agency Nos. A76-611-077
A92-694-374

MEMORANDUM^{*}

On Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted March 18, 2008^{**}

Before: CANBY, T.G. NELSON, and BEA, Circuit Judges.

Balltazar Pintor-Pintor and Leticia Esquivel-Garcia, natives and citizens of Mexico, petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order

^{*} This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

^{**} The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

05-72707

denying their motion to reopen removal proceedings. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for abuse of discretion the denial of a motion to reopen, *Iturribarria v. INS*, 321 F.3d 889, 894 (9th Cir. 2003), and we deny the petition for review.

The BIA considered the evidence petitioners submitted and acted within its broad discretion in determining that the evidence was insufficient to warrant reopening. *See Singh v. INS*, 295 F.3d 1037, 1039 (9th Cir. 2002) (The BIA's denial of a motion to reopen shall be reversed only if it is "arbitrary, irrational, or contrary to law."). Petitioners' contention that the BIA failed adequately to explain its reasons for denying the motion to reopen is not supported by the record.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.